less than $\frac{7}{24}$ grain of heroine per tablet, and less than $2\frac{1}{2}$ grains of terpin hydrate per tablet, to wit, 0.03 grain of heroine per tablet and 1.81 grains of terpin hydrate per tablet, and was sold as a product which contained $\frac{1}{24}$ grain of heroine per tablet, and $2\frac{1}{2}$ grains of terpin hydrate per tablet.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Heroin $\frac{1}{24}$ gr. Terpin Hydrate $2\frac{1}{2}$ gr.," borne on the label attached to the bottle containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in that it represented that the tablets contained in said bottle each contained not less than $\frac{1}{24}$ grain of heroine and not less than $2\frac{1}{2}$ grains of terpin hydrate, whereas, in truth and in fact, each of said tablets did not contain $\frac{1}{24}$ grain of heroine, and did not contain $2\frac{1}{2}$ grains of terpin hydrate, but contained a less amount, to wit, approximately 0.03 grain of heroine and approximately 1.81 grains of terpin hydrate, and for the further reason that it contained heroine, and the label failed to bear a statement of the quantity or proportion of heroine contained therein.

Adulteration of the article labeled "Ammosol-Codeia Tablets" was alleged for the reason that its strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold, in this, that it was a product which contained less than 2 grains of phenylacetamide per tablet, and less than 0.25 grain of codeia per tablet, to wit, 1.48 grains of phenylacetamide per tablet, and 0.158 grain of codeia per tablet, and was sold as a product which contained 2 grains of phenylacetamide per tablet, and 0.25 grain of codeia per tablet.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Codeia ½ gr. * * * Phenylacetamide 2 grains," borne on the label attached to the bottle containing the article, regarding it and the ingredients and substances contained therein, was false and misleading in this, that it represented that the tablets contained in said bottles each contained not less than ½ grain of codeia and 2 grains of phenylacetamide, whereas, in truth and in fact, each of said tablets did not contain ½ grain of codeia and 2 grains of phenylacetamide, but did contain a less amount, to wit, approximately 0.158 grain of codeia, and 1.48 grains of phenylacetamide; and for the further reason that it contained acetanilid, and the label failed to bear a statement of the quantity or proportion of acetanilid contained therein; and for the further reason that the label did not indicate that codeia is a derivative of morphine.

On March 12, 1919, the defendant company entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$25.

J. R. Riggs, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

6787. Adulteration of shell eggs. U. S. * * * v. 100 Cases of Shell Eggs. Good portion ordered sold. (F. & D. No. 9258. I. S. No. 13553-r. S. No. E-1087.)

On August 7, 1918, the United States attorney for the Northern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 100 cases of shell eggs at Binghamton, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped on June 24, 1918, by Turner, Clegg & O'Neill Co., Chicago, Ill., and transported from the State of Illinois into the State of New York, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that it was in an excessive amount decomposed, filthy, and putrid animal substance, and was in whole or in part unfit for human consumption.

On August 16, 1918, the case having come on to be heard, it was ordered by the court that the eggs should be examined and that the good portion of the eggs should be sold.